

Application No. 09/924,910
Response dated March 23, 2005
Reply to Office Action of January 27, 2005

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

REMARKS

Rejections based on 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-3, 6-7, 9-11, 13-14 and 16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 6,456,306 issued to Chin et al. ("Chin") in view of U.S. Patent Application No. US 2001/0056486 of Kosaka ("Kosaka"). Claims 4, 5, 8, 12, 15 and 17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Chin and Kosaka and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,581,797 issued to Baker et al. ("Baker"). Claims 18-23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Chin in view of Kosaka and Baker. Applicants respectfully traverses all these rejections.

The Office Action also cites to Baker to support an obviousness rejection of claims 4, 5, 8, and 18-23. Applicants respectfully reassert their nonanalogous-art argument and, respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider the position that Baker is non nonanalogous art. Baker used the term software "system" in its title, but the whole of the patent speaks of displaying hierarchal information of a large software program. Starting even the first sentence, in their abstract, the patentees explain that the invention is "an interactive method and apparatus for displaying structure, statistics, and characteristics of large software systems, i.e. of more than one million lines of code." See Baker Abstract, (emphasis added). The specification includes reference to "code" over 46 times. Absolutely no mention of monitoring displaying communication network functions is provided.

But Baker is neither in the field of Applicants' endeavor nor pertinent to the particular problem with which Applicants are concerned. MPEP 2145 § IX. As mentioned in Applicants' previous response, incorporated by reference herein, Baker describes a method and apparatus for displaying hierarchal information of a large software system, i.e. of more than one

Application No. 09/924,910
Response dated March 23, 2005
Reply to Office Action of January 27, 2005

million lines of source code. *See* Abstract. Baker goes on to state that "[i]t is [the] object of the present invention to provide an apparatus for displaying information and statistics about the changes to the code of a large software system to enable technical personnel to understand the relationship between its subsystem, directories and files." *See* col. 2, lines 4-8. Thus, Baker is concerned with the problem of visually representing a complicated computer program, which is not the problem with which Applicants are concerned. Consequently, Baker cannot properly be relied upon to reject Applicants' claimed invention.

With Baker removed as a proper prior-art reference, Applicant has incorporated into each independent claim at least one feature from one or more dependent claims that were rejected because of Baker. As previously mentioned, Baker was relied on to reject claims 4, 5, 8, 12, 15 & 17 and 18-23.

Independent claim 4 has been amended to recite "scaling a size of a display division to said range of data values," previously recited in now cancelled claim 4.

Independent claim 5 has been amended to recite the following features previously recited in now cancelled claim 15:

linking at least one of said display divisions to additional information associated with said network function associated therewith; and

displaying said additional information in response to placement of a graphic cursor within said display division.


Independent claim 18 had been amended to recite the feature "scaling a size of at least one display subdivision to a variable associated with a data member represented by said one display subdivision" of now canceled claim 23.

Application No. 09/924,910
Response dated March 23, 2005
Reply to Office Action of January 27, 2005

CONCLUSION

Applicants believe that the amendments above place this Application in condition for allowance, and a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested. No fee is believed due in connection with submitting this correspondence, but the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional amount required, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 21-0765.

Respectfully submitted,


Jesse J. Camacho
Reg. No. 51,258

JJCZ/ms

SHOOK, HARDY, & BACON L.L.P.
2555 Grand Blvd.
Kansas City, MO 64108-2613
Tel.: 816/474-6550
Fax: 816/421-5547

Attorney Docket No. 1536/SPRI.107520

**This Page is Inserted by IFW Indexing and Scanning
Operations and is not part of the Official Record**

BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images include but are not limited to the items checked:

☒ BLACK BORDERS

☐ IMAGE CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES

☐ FADED TEXT OR DRAWING

☒ BLURRED OR ILLEGIBLE TEXT OR DRAWING

☐ SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES

☐ COLOR OR BLACK AND WHITE PHOTOGRAPHS

☐ GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS

☒ LINES OR MARKS ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT

☐ REFERENCE(S) OR EXHIBIT(S) SUBMITTED ARE POOR QUALITY

☐ OTHER: _____

IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.

As rescanning these documents will not correct the image problems checked, please do not report these problems to the IFW Image Problem Mailbox.